Application No. Applicant(s) 09/440,692 MOTOYAMA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Syed Zia 2155 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Syed Zia. (3)Surinder Sachar. (2) Phillip Tran. (4)___ Date of Interview: 20 December 2002. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: _ Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3, 8 Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: i) Prior fel rejection was discussed on the highlig independent and dependent the 2) No agreement home reneted about allowablely of claus; but application wentured and expenses home difference and exemple with consider that difference in ment of (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims a allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless Te paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

U.S. Petent and Trademark Office PTO-413 (Rev. 03- 98)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required